REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed May 31, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 1, 2, 6-14, 18-28, 32 and 33 are pending and rejected. Applicants have herein amended claims 1, 7-8, 10, 13, 19-20, 22, 25, 27, 33.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion, Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103.

It is to be understood that Applicants, by amending the claims, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response including amendments.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 1-2, 13-14, 27-28 and 33

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 13-14, 27-28 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,363,065 to Thornton et al. (hereinafter "Thornton") in view of U.S. Patent 6,918,034 to Sengodan et al. (hereinafter "Sengodan") and U.S. Patent 6,477,164 B1 to Vargo et al. (hereinafter "Vargo") and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,717,948 to Subbiah (hereinafter "Subbiah"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo, and Subbiah, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 1, as a whole. Namely, Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo, and Subbiah, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the limitation of "in response to a determination that said destination is serviced by said second VoIP gateway, multiplexing, at said first VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic if said second voice traffic is being provided to said second VoIP gateway," as claimed in Applicants' claim 1.

As described at least in Applicants' response to the previous Office Action, although Thornton teaches multiplexing of voice traffic, Thornton merely teaches that multiplexing is performed for transmission of voice traffic over a PSTN. For example, Thornton states that "...a signal on a channel in an incoming T1 trunk, such as that carried by TDM lines 268, and originating from the PSTN, can be switched, through switch 250, to a corresponding time slot on an outgoing T1 trunk, such as over TDM lines 278, to the PBX, and vice versa, in order to support carriage of that call over the PSTN between caller and called locations." (Thornton, Col. 13, Lines 35-41). In other words, Thornton clearly fails to teach or suggest multiplexing voice traffic for transporting the multiplexed voice traffic to a second VoIP gateway utilizing a plurality of User Datagram Protocol (UDP)/Internet Protocol (IP) transport packets, as claimed in Applicants' claim 1, and, thus, must also fail to teach or suggest "multiplexing, at said first VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic if said second voice traffic is being provided to said second VoIP gateway," as claimed in Applicants' claim 1.

Furthermore, Sengodan, Vargo, and Subbiah, alone or in combination, fail to bridge the substantial gap between Thornton and Applicants' claim 1.

Sengodan discloses encryption and authentication of mini-packets in a multiplexed real time protocol (RTP) payload. As taught in Sengodan, mini-packets are added to an RTP payload, which is then padded to ensure that each mini-packet is an integral multiple of a predetermined block size. Sengodan further discloses that users share a single RTP/UDP/IP connection by adding mini-packets to an RTP payload. (Sengodan, Col. 6, Lines 25-27).

Sengodan, however, fails to teach or suggest multiplexing, at a first VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic if said second voice traffic is being provided to said second VoIP gateway, as claimed in Applicants' claim 1.

Rather, Sengodan discloses that mini-packets are multiplexed on a single RTP payload. The multiplexing of mini-packets on a single RTP packet, as taught in Sengodan, is not multiplexing of modified RTP packets for transport using UDP/IP transport packets, as claimed in Applicants' claim 1. As such, Sengodan, alone or in combination with Thornton, fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 1, as a whole.

Furthermore, Vargo and Subbiah, alone or in combination, fail to bridge the substantial gap between Thornton and Sengodan and Applicants' claim 1.

Vargo discloses a system for real-time data and voice transmission using originating and destination gateways and associated transmuxes. Specifically, Vargo teaches that a voice packet is received at an originating gateway and that a destination gateway address and a destination transmux address are appended to the voice packet. The voice packet is provided from the originating gateway to an originating transmux. The originating transmux breaks the voice packet into gateway subpackets. The gateway subpackets are aggregated and the destination transmux address is removed. The transmux voice packets are then transmitted to the destination transmux, where they are broken into transmux subpackets. The transmux subpackets are sorted and aggregated by a destination gateway address, the destination gateway address is removed from the packets, and the voice packets are provided to the destination gateway.

Vargo, however, fails to teach or suggest multiplexing, at a first VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic if said second voice traffic is being provided to said second VoIP gateway, as claimed in Applicants' claim 1. Rather, Vargo teaches that voice packets are aggregated at the originating gateway and provided to an originating transmux, where the packets are broken into gateway subpackets. The aggregation of gateway subpackets at an originating transmux for transmission to a destination transmux, as taught in Vargo, does not teach or suggest multiplexing, at a VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic, as claimed in

Applicants' claim 1. As such, Vargo, alone or in combination with Thornton and Sengodan, fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 1, as a whole.

Furthermore, Subbiah fails to bridge the substantial gap between Thornton, Sengodan, and Vargo, alone or in combination, and Applicants' claim 1.

Subbiah discloses a knowledge-based connection admission scheme for providing efficient multiplexing of data and speech over Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) Adaptation Layer 2 (AAL2). Specifically, Subbiah is directed to ATM networks and, more particularly, a subset of the ATM communications protocols; namely, the ATM AAL2 environment which provides a fixed length packet transport protocol used for voice communication. Subbiah leverages various features within the ATM network to enable opportunistic insertion of data traffic into speech traffic to replace padding or silence.

Subbiah, however, is entirely unlike the claimed invention. Subbiah is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any VoIP gateway or other VoIP teachings, much less multiplexing, at a first VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic if said second voice traffic is being provided to said second VoIP gateway, as claimed in Applicants' claim 1.

Thus, since Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo, and Subbiah each fail to teach or suggest "in response to a determination that said destination is serviced by said second VoIP gateway, multiplexing, at said first VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic if said second voice traffic is being provided to said second VoIP gateway," any permissible combination of Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo, and Subbiah must also fail to teach or suggest "in response to a determination that said destination is serviced by said second VoIP gateway, multiplexing, at said first VoIP gateway, at least one modified RTP packet conveying said first voice traffic with at least one modified RTP packet conveying said second voice traffic if said second voice traffic is being provided to said second VoIP gateway." Therefore, Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo, and

Subbiah, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 1, as a whole.

As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 13, 27, and 33 are patentable over Thornton in view of Sengodan in view of Vargo in view of Subbiah and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Furthermore, claims 2, 14, and 28 depend directly from independent claims 1, 13, 27, and 33 and recite additional limitations thereof. As such and at least for the same reasons as discussed above, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are also patentable over Thornton in view of Sengodan in view of Vargo in view of Subbiah, and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 6-12, 18-26, and 32

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-12, 18-26, and 32(a) as being unpatentable over Thornton in view of Sengodan and Vargo and Subbiah and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,600,653 to Chitre et al. (hereinafter "Chitre"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6-12, 18-24, and 32

Claims 6-12, 18-24, and 32 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 13, and 27, and recite additional features thereof. For at least the reasons discussed above, Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo and Subbiah, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' independent claims 1, 13, and 27, as a whole. Accordingly, any attempted combination of Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo and Subbiah with any additional references, in a rejection against the dependent claims, would still result in a gap in the combined teachings in regards to the independent claims. As such, Applicants submit that dependent claims 6-12, 18-24, and 32 are patentable over Thornton, Sengodan,

Vargo, Subbiah, and Chitre, and fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 25-26

Applicants' independent claim 25 recites similar relevant limitations to those recited in independent claims 1, 13, 27, and 33. As such, and at least for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 13, 27, and 33, claim 25 is patentable over Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo and Subbiah and fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Furthermore, Chitre fails to bridge the substantial gap between Thornton, Sengodan, Vargo, and Subbiah and Applicants' claim 1.

Chitre discloses a technique for improving ATM operation over a communications link having burst the bit errors. Applicants again disagree with the Examiner's combining of ATM structure and VoIP structure to cobble together a hypothetical structure which allegedly renders the claimed invention obvious.

As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 25 is patentable over Thornton in view of Sengodan, Vargo and Subbiah and further in view of Chitre, and fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Furthermore, claim 26 depends directly from independent claim 25 and recites additional limitations thereof. As such, and at least for the same reasons as discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 26 is also patentable over Thornton in view of Sengodan, Vargo, and Subbiah and further in view of Chitre, and fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 0 9 2007

CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Michael Bentley at (732) 383-1434 or Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/8/07

Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

PAGE 16/16 * RCVD AT 8/9/2007 2:12:13 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/9 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+17325309808 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-38